REMARKS

The communication issued by the Office have been reviewed and reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested

Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 14, 21, 23-31, 33 and 38-40 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1and 21 are independent claims.

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 14, 21, 23-31, 33 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13, 14, 21, 23-25, 28-31, 33 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Siah (WO 02/15024). Claims 6-7 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Siah in view of Official Notice.

With regard to the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, the Office Action asserts that the claim element "an indication of a method for deriving a title identification for each of said content providers ..." is interpreted in such a way that the location is 'at least one part of the method.' However, the 'location' can be interpreted as part of the local data base or even as part of the WebDVD player and therefore it is unclear."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However in order to advance the prosecution of this matter, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to present the subject matter in better form. More specifically, the claims have been amended to recite "an **indication for selecting a method**" and "wherein the Title_ID is derived in accordance **a selected method and the information in the pre-selected location**." No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 5, lines 22-25 and Table 2.

.

In maintaining the rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13, 14, 21, 23-25, 28-31, 33 and 38-40 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Siah, the Office Action refers to "Figure 8, items 804 and 806 for teaching that the C-PBIT information is read from a database in ram which is then used by the method to calculate the DVD signature (Title_ID). This is a location that has pre-selected information used to derive the Title_ID. The information that is read is also an 'indication' of a method to be used. "

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, in order to advance the prosecution of this matter, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to further recite the invention in better form. More specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite "an indication for selecting a ~~of a~~ method for deriving a title identification for each of said content providers" and " wherein the Title_ID is derived in accordance with the selected method and the information in the pre-selected location." No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least in Table 2.

Siah discloses a system including a DVD client device that determines a DVD signature from navigation information read from a DVD and provides the determined DVD signature to a DVD information server that is used to identify particular web content that relates to the DVD. The web content may include promotional material specific to the DVD. Siah in addition discloses that the DVD signature is used to access a local data base that may include a record corresponding to the DVD (see page 11 and the description associated with Figure 11). If a record associated with the DVD signature is not found, then the DVD signature is provided to a DVD server to update the information in the local data (see, for example, page 11, line 7). The updated information includes URL values (see page 11, line 24).

Siah further discloses that different DVD signatures may be stored for the same DVD title (see page 14, line 3). The different DVD signatures may be used

in different regions or to identify different version of the content of the DVD within a same region.

Siah discloses two different methods of determining the DVD signature. The different methods relate to using information from the C-PBIT. (see Figures 13 and 14). In addition Siah discloses "[[a]] myrid of possible calculations including but not limited to other calculations based on Boolean and arithmetic operations on navigation data, preferably C-PBIT data are possible." (see page 15, lines 25-27).

However, although Siah discloses different methods for determining a signature, Siah is silent with regard to an **indication of selecting a method** for deriving a title identification for each of the content providers included in the local database to be used, as is recited in the claims.

Although the Office Action asserts that "the information that is read is also an 'indication' of a method to be used," applicant submits that based on the processing shown in Figures 13 and 14, the algorithms (i.e., methods) used to determine the title identification are independent of the data read. Applicant submits that the information read is not an indication of a method to be used. Rather Siah teaches that a method (or different methods) may be used to determine a title identification. But does not teach the claim element of an **"indication for selecting a method…"**

A claim is anticipated if an only if each of the elements recited in claims may be found in a single prior art reference.

In this case, Siah cannot be said to anticipate the invention claimed, as recited in claims 1 and 21, as Siah fails to disclose the claim element of "**an indication for selecting a method** for deriving a title identification for each of the content providers" or **a location defining a pre-selected location** where information that is to be used by the indicated method may be found.

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 21, and, hence, these claims are not anticipated by Siah for at least their dependency upon an allowable base claim.

With regard to the rejection of claims 6, 7, 26 and 27 as being rejected under 35 USC §103 over Siah in view of Official Notice, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the aforementioned claims. As shown above, Siah fails to disclose a material element recited in the independent claims from which the aforementioned claims depend and the Official Notice taken provides no suggestion or teaching to correct the deficiency found to exist in Siah.

A claimed invention is prima facie obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations

In this case, the combination of Siah and Official Notices fails to disclose a material element recited in the independent claims and thus, the combination of Siah and Official Notice cannot be said to render obvious the subject matter recited in the aforementioned dependent claims.

For the amendments made to the claims, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims are in allowable form and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Belk, Reg. No. 33357

Date: October 4, 2010

  /Carl A. Giordano/

By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,780

Mail all correspondence to:
Michael E. Belk, Esq.
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9643
Fax: (914) 332-0615